DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 007 CS 200 980

AUTHOR	Politzer, Robert L.
TITLE	Problems in Applying Foreign Language Teaching Methods to the Teaching of Standard English as a Second Dialect. R and D Memorandum 40.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	RDM-40
PUB DATE	Dec 68
CONTRACT	OEC-6-10-078
NOTE	22p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Factors; *Language Instruction; *Learning Motivation; *Nonstandard Dialects; Sociolinguistics; Standard Spoken Usage; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; *Teaching Methods; *Tenl

ABSTRACT

This booklet comments on the second dialect teaching situation with special emphasis given to the role of the native dialect, the definition of the standard dialect, special factors affecting the pupil, teaching methodology, and teacher training. The first section examines dialects associated with the influence of a specific foreign language, pidgin or creole, and social or regional substandard varieties of English with particular emphasis on the latter and its pedagogical implications. The second section discusses the definition of standard English, and the third section focuses on special considerations concerning the learning situation of the pupil, that is, integrative versus instrumental motivation and differences between the theories of cultural deprivation and cultural differences. Teaching methodology, especially foreign language teaching, is discussed in section four. Finally, teacher training recommendations stressing the need for teachers to possess an attitude which recognizes that substandard dialects are regular systems of communication in their own right are discussed in the last section. (HOD)

ED 087007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STANFORD CENTER

FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

IN TEACHING

Research and Development Memorandum No. 40

PROBLEMS IN APPLYING FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS TO THE TEACHING OF STANDARD ENGLISH AS A SECOND DIALECT

Robert L. Politzer

School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California

December 1968

The research and development reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program (Contract No. OE-6-10-078, Project No. 5-0252-0402).

OS 200 980

In the literature dealing with teaching of standard English to the culturally and economically disadvantaged the suggestion is often made that they be taught standard English by teaching methodologies taken from foreign language instruction (Carroll & Feigenbaum 67, Coflin 67, Stewart 64). While there is no general agreement about the preferred foreign language methodology, the suggestion itself implies that there is agreement on one important fact: the cultural and economic disadvantages are accompanied and further magnified by a linguistic disadvantage. Most of the culturally and economically disadvantaged are not native speakers of standard English, but speakers of a nonstandard dialect. Yet in many situations, both in school and out of school, they are treated as if they were speakers of standard English. As a consequence, they are given little or no opportunity to learn the standard language, because the schools--which ought to provide this opportunity--have in fact been most guilty of assuming that <u>all</u> children are native speakers of standard English. Thus, children whose native language is a nonstandard dialect are expected to learn to read as if they were already speakers of standard English, to use teaching materials prepared for speakers of standard English, and to grasp the reading rules which are formulated in standard English (Labov 66). From studies made in elementary school classrooms, it has been found that in the initial stages of instruction many teachers use a vocabulary 20 to 50 percent of whose words may be unknown or unfamiliar to some of their pupils (Webster 66). No wonder, then, that the school experience of many of the linguistically disadvantaged does little to remedy their disadvantages but--on the contrary--accentuates the language deficit of the learner.

We do not expect anyone who does not know a foreign language--let us say French--to perform tasks which assume knowledge of French as a prerequisite. We do not expect that person to learn to read French as if it were his native language; we do not teach him other subjects in

French; nor do we ask him to take I.Q. tests in French, simply because it is obvious that knowledge of a language must be created before it can be used as a tool for communication. However, we do ask speakers of a nonstandard language to perform tasks requiring knowledge of the standard because--unlike the foreign language situation--the communication failure caused by the lack of knowledge of the standard language is not always obvious, and may be only partial, in which case the result is even more insidious.

In spite of the many and obvious parallels between foreign language teaching and the teaching of a second dialect, there are also many differences between the two situations. This article will therefore be a series of comments on the second dialect teaching situation with special emphasis on these differences and with specific reference to the following areas: (a) the role of the native dialect; (b) the definition of the standard; (c) special factors affecting the pupil; (d) teaching methodology; and (e) teacher training.

The Role of the Native Dialect

From the purely linguistic point of view, the native dialect of the pupil normally will belong to any one of the following three categories:

A. Dialects associated with the influence of a specific foreign language.

B. Pidgin or Creole dialects.

C. Social or regional substandard varieties of English (not classifiable under A or B above).

Within the United States the major examples of category A are, of course, supplied by the substandard dialects of the immigrant ghettoes, by the dialects of the Puerto Rican or Mexican urban populations, and by the dialects of the Mexican-Americans of the Western and Southwestern states.

Both pidgin and Creole dialects are linguistically different from both categories A and C in that they completely lack some of the major grammatical structures of English. They may have developed under

the influence of some other language or languages, but unlike those dialects typical of category A these linguistic influences usually cannot be directly ascertained. The major and perhaps the only examples of pidgin dialect spoken within the United States are the pidgin English of Hawaii (Tsuzaki 66) and the Negro patois called Gullah spoken in parts of Virginia and Georgia (Bennett 08, Stewart 68).

Within the group C dialects belong all the nonstandard varieties of English which are derived from an English substrate. The differentiation between regional and social dialects is not always easy to make. Regional substandard speech can be easily transformed into nonregional (social) substandard by migrations--e.g., from Southern rural areas to the urban ghettoes of the North. An obvious example of regional substandard is the dialect of the "poor whites" of Appalachia. Another obvious example for group C is that of the various dialects within the Negro community, which may, in fact, still bear traces of a former Creole type of speech (see Stewart 68). However, for all practical purposes, it seems that there is enough grammatical similarity between the various Negro dialects and other English dialects to justify their classification in category C.

Whatever the exact linguistic category of the pupil's native dialect, in the second dialect teaching situation it accounts for the same linguistic interference which the pupil's native language provides in foreign language teaching. The persistent mistakes which a native speaker of English makes in French can largely be accounted for through his native English. The persistent mistakes made by, let us say, a speaker of Mexican-American English or of a Negro dialect in his attempts to speak standard English are attributable to the structure and grammar of his native dialect.

The parallel between native nonstandard dialect and native language ceases, of course, if we consider the problem of educational status. In foreign language teaching, the status to be accorded to the native language of the pupil is not a problem. Whether or not to use the pupil's native language in class is a purely pedagogical decision which does not reflect on the status of the native language. However, in the

case of teaching a second dialect the role and status to be accorded to the pupil's native dialect can become a source of considerable controversy. There are several options available: (a) we can deny the substandard dialect any status whatsoever and make its elimination the avowed goal of instruction; (b) we can conduct instruction in such a way that we simply ignore the substandard speech, without openly attempting to attack and eliminate it; (c) we can accord some status to the substandard and even attempt to raise its prestige by including it in the instructional process in various ways which imply varying degrees of status or recognition. For example, the substandard may be discussed openly in class; or, it may be compared with standard English and presented as a legitimate, alternate way of speech, not only permissible but perhaps even desirable in certain situations. It may even be accorded official recognition to the degree that instruction in some subject, or perhaps initial instruction in reading or writing, is carried out in the native (nonstandard) dialect.

Of the options mentioned above it is probably the first one--elimination of the substandard--which has traditionally dominated the teaching of standard English. Of all the possible options it is also the one which at present seems to be least likely to be advocated by any of the experts. There are evidently various and complementary reasons for this point of view. To expect the actual elimination of the pupil's native dialect is probably a futile goal in any case. Few people ever really forget the dialect of the home environment in which they were raised. From the purely practical or realistic point of view, the teaching of standard language should aim not to eliminate the native dialect but rather to produce a bilingual pupil, or--to use a term coined by Charles Ferguson (59)--to produce a state of diglossia, i.e., a situation where even within the speech community speakers can switch from one type of speech to another according to what type seems appropriate in the specific situation.

If bilingualism or diglossia is the ultimate goal of instruction, then it becomes necessary to consider the extensive research on the effects of bilingualism. One of the most important recent findings is that bilingualism does not cause any slowdown or deficit in intellectual

development. In fact, the bilingual child may have certain advantages in the ease with which he forms and expresses concepts, provided that the bilingualism is not accompanied by anomie, which is the feeling of loss of identification with a specific cultural group (Peal & Lambert 62). Thus a direct attack on the home language of the pupil is likely to produce exactly this uncertain identification, and would be an obvious departure from the now widely recognized need to provide pride in the native cultural environment of the pupil--one aim of what is now being called "self-enhancing education." As it has been so nicely stated by Riessman, "One's native language is not to be denied lightly, for it is, in very basic ways one's own self" (Riessman 66).

While overt attack on the native language of the pupil does not seem advisable in any case, there is at least one linguistic situation in which eventual elimination of the pupil's native substandard dialect can be quite openly and safely envisaged as the long run goal. In situation A, the self-enhancing aspects of education can be provided easily by the native cultural background and the standard language associated with it. Speakers of Mexican-American English and/or Spanish are quite often already bilinguals. They speak a substandard variety of Spanish as well as a substandard variety of English, the deficiency in either case reflecting the influence which the two languages have exercised upon each other. The best solution, advocated by many experts (e.g., Andersson 67, Gaarder 67) and endorsed by a resolution of the National Education Association (NEA 68), is to transform these speakers of two substandard dialects into speakers of two standard languages. The exact details of how one reaches this goal are still subject to discussion and experimentation--as evidenced by those practices now being employed in the Southwestern Regional Educational Laboratory. The eventual solution will lie in providing some kind of bilingual education.

Within the United States there is at present only one program concerned with teaching standard English to speakers of a pidgin dialect--the Keaukaha (Hilo, Hawaii) project. The attitude adopted toward the native language of a pupil in that project has been one of careful respect which is supposed to make it clear that pidgin English is a

permissible, adequate form of communication in certain situations (Crowley 68). Evidently, overt use of pidgin, even if only for purposes of contrast, is not contemplated at the present time.

It is in the linguistic situation involving social or regional substandards that the exact status to be accorded to the native dialect becomes most problematical. In some situations, e.g., in the Mississippi Action Project, the decision has been made actually to use the native dialect of the pupil for instructional purposes. Consequently, teaching materials have been written in the native dialect in order to introduce elementary school children to reading and writing in the vernacular rather than in the "foreign language" of standard English (see Keislar & Stern 68). Two arguments can be advanced in favor of this procedure. One is the already mentioned need to provide status and cultural identity through the overt use of the pupil's native language; the other is the general argument that initial education, especially the introduction of reading and writing, can be made almost insurmountably difficult if the pupil's already complicated learning tasks are confounded with the problem of learning a foreign or quasi-foreign language (Bull 55). Whether these attempts to provide instruction in the dialect will accomplish any of these goals--either self-enhancement or the ultimate facilitation of learning reading and writing of standard English--remains to be established. In any case, it will be difficult to generalize the results obtained in one situation to another situation because dialects vary in their actual distance from standard English and socio-economic factors are seldom identical in different situations.

Some recent experiments (Keislar & Stern 68) have shown that, in some situations at least, initial instruction in the nonstandard dialect does not contribute to greater achievement in terms of retention of subject matter or level of conceptualization. There is also some evidence that the speakers of the substandard dialect have little interest in raising the status of their speech. Professor Labov points out that by and large the language standards of the adult Negro community are no different from those of the white community. The demand recently

made by the black students of Ravenswood High School in East Palo Alto, California, that a standard African language (Swahili) be offered as part of the curriculum indicates that the linguistic aspects of self-enhancing, cultural-identity education will perhaps be met by the teaching of a standard language rather than by trying to elevate non-standard speech to a higher status. Thus, we may tentatively conclude that the actual classroom utilization of the nonstandard should be confined demonstrations of contrasts between standard and nonstandard while comparisons between the two should be carried out in a way that makes it clear that they are simply alternate and equally legitimate modes of communication.

The Definition of the Standard

The problem of what does constitute standard English exists primarily in what some linguists might call the rather superficial or "surface" aspects of pronunciation. There may also be disagreement in the area of grammar (of the "It is I" versus the "It is me" type), but the major features of standard English grammar are, by and large, agreed upon. Even in the area of pronunciation, the definition of the standard is not likely to cause major problems in linguistic categories A and B. Dialects created by obvious foreign language intrusions and pidgin dialects both usually have phonetic features which are so different and distant from English that the variations possible within English seem somehow relatively unimportant by comparison. The situation is not unlike that arising in foreign language teaching, where the question is whether to teach Latin American Spanish or Castilian Spanish. Generally, the criterion is "whatever may make the most sense," although more often than not the choice may be made by an arbitrary decision.

In the case of linguistic situation C, the definition of the standard becomes a more delicate and somewhat touchy problem: how does one distinguish between permissible variations within the standard as opposed to substandard speech? What is "standard American" pronunciation? The speech used by radio and TV commentators? Some sort of Middlewestern American? The following is a simple example of the possible confusion:

many of the features of Negro speech are also found in the speech of Southerners--even of those who are highly educated. What sense would it make to teach a speaker of a Negro dialect that certain features of pronunciation were not standard English if the very same features occurred in the speech of a President of the United States?

There are, of course, various ways in which one could establish criteria for defining what does, or at least what does not, constitute standard pronunciation. We would like to label these criteria as either sociological, phonemic, or grammatical. Sociological criteria would be based on the simple recognition that for some strange and often undefinable reasons certain pronunciations are associated with ignorance and are considered substandard while others are not. R-less pronunciation and the adding of postvocalic r (Cuba*r* and Wa*r*shington) are acceptable--after all, weren't they in the speech of a beloved President of the United States? The famous Brooklynese mispronunciation of vowel plus r (boid for bird) is a sign of ignorance and is likely to keep the speaker from gaining any kind of social recognition--or a teaching position in New York. For purely practical reasons, the teacher of standard English is undoubtedly forced to take into consideration these linguistically rather arbitrary dicta of society. At the same time, however, he must realize that they are arbitrary and not make the old mistake of teaching that standard English is defined by the speaker's avoidance of certain socially unacceptable pronunciations. In this connection, it is important for the teacher to remember that certain pronunciations may in time become "unacceptable" because they are associated with a particular class or minority group. Thus, if the prejudice against a pronunciation is the result of the prejudice against a minority group, manipulating the speech of the minority is not likely to have any real influence on prejudicial attitudes themselves.

Phonemic criteria for establishing standard English would attempt to avoid pronunciations which would, by introducing additional homonyms into standard speech, create problems and misunderstandings in general communication or in reading instruction. Actually even this criterion is ultimately contaminated by pure sociological considerations. Homonyms

exist in the language in any case: some are accepted parts of even the most rigorous standard, e.g., pane, pain. Others are so widely accepted that few if any listeners--or even classroom teachers engaged in the process of reading instruction--would question the pronunciation that accounts for the phonetic merger, (e.g., merry, marry, Mary merge in a large part of the Middlewest). What makes mergers like pin and pen unacceptable is ultimately a sociological criterion. Still, just because some homonyms are permissible, there is no reason why communication (and reading instruction) in standard English should be encumbered by yet an additional array of homonyms. Avoidance of homonyms could thus be used as a possible guideline.

The safest and in our opinion most defensible guideline for establishing minimum requirements for a standard pronunciation is furnished by the grammatical criterion: a pronunciation must be considered a substandard (and conversely an alternate standard pronunciation must be taught) if it interferes with the possibility of using standard grammar. As has been shown and discussed in some detail by Labov & Cohen (67a), there are various substandard pronunciations which make it impossible to use standard grammar. Principally, these substandard pronunciations consist in the dissolution or complete effacement of final consonants or consonantal clusters, on which much of English grammar depends: e.g., final -s as plural sign or a sign of the possessive or the third person singular; -ed as a sign of the past tense or the past participle. The failure to produce the significant markers of tense or person can hardly be considered a "surface difference" between standard and dialect, and a minimal pronunciation requirement for standard English must necessarily include an adequate pronunciation of final consonants and consonant groups of grammatical significance.

Special Considerations Concerning the Pupil

In any learning situation the pupil's contribution to achievement is obviously determined by his motivation and his aptitude. In teaching the disadvantaged, both motivation and aptitude may represent special problems. In learning a foreign language the factors involved in motivation have been classified as instrumental and integrative (e.g., Gardner 60, Lambert 67). Integrative motivation is associated

with a desire to become acquainted with or to identify with the cultural and/or ethnic community which uses the foreign language. Instrumental motivation is based on the clear recognition of some sort of material advantage to be gained by the knowledge of the foreign language. The motivation associated with having to get a good grade or to fulfill a requirement must ultimately be classed as instrumental. At any rate, the extent to which either integrative or instrumental motivation are significant factors in the teaching of standard English to the disadvantaged is highly debatable.

In the already mentioned Keaukaha experiment (teaching standard English to children speaking Hawaiian pidgin), the experimenters were able to adopt "a very uncomplicated position in the matter of student motivation" based among others on the assumption that children "come to school expecting to do everything the teacher tells them to do. . ." and that "they want to please the teacher and be praised for doing what she is doing exactly as she does it" (Crowley 68). Obviously none of these assumptions are likely to stand up in an urban ghetto situation. Integrative motivation for learning standard English is likely to be absent--to say the least--and instrumental motivation would have to be created by convincing the pupil of the material advantages to be gained through the use of the standard language. Even the instrumental motivation created by grades may be nonexistent in many cases, since the entire value system of the school may be completely foreign and strange to the minority-group child. As a matter of fact, the motivation problem may very well be the most crucial one in the entire complex of problems concerning the contribution of the school to the betterment of the disadvantaged in general and the solution of the language problem in particular. This fact has been rather dramatically brought home by several studies, most recently by a research study undertaken at Columbia University (Labov & Robins 67) that demonstrated (a) that the value system held by members of a Harlem street gang, which stressed such concepts as "toughness," "skill in fighting," etc., was in direct conflict with acquiring standard English because it was associated by gang members with effeminate types of behavior; (b) that achievement in language arts and especially the ability to read showed an amazingly high inverse correlation with the degree of adherence to the value system

of the peer group. In other words, the teaching of standard English may in some cases take place in a situation characterized not only by a lack of motivation to achieve but, beyond that, by a motivation not to achieve.

To what extent, and at what particular age level, the culturally and economically disadvantaged student may also be disadvantaged in terms of his linguistic learning potential is another rather complex and obviously touchy problem. Some investigators (chiefly Bernstein 61) noted that the speech of the socio-economic lower classes seems to be characterized by a smaller vocabulary and fewer and lower-level abstractions than the speech of the economically and socially more fortunate. On the basis of such observations some psychologists and sociologists--chiefly Martin Deutsch (e.g., 65)--have constructed a rather elaborate theory at the core of which stands the notion that the disadvantaged child suffers from being, or perhaps rather from having been, deprived of cultural (and this includes verbal) stimuli during essential growth periods of his life. Not having been exposed to verbal stimuli, not having been exposed to higher levels of verbal abstraction and conceptualization, the disadvantaged child does not develop the ability to use language and with it the ability to conceptualize to the same degree as other children. It is well known that many of the Head Start programs were organized with the view of compensating for the "stimulus deprivation" which occurred during the preschool period.

The concept of linguistic or cultural deprivation has been questioned and at times rather severely criticized by some researchers (chiefly linguistics) as being the result of a mirage created by misunderstandings which occur in a situation of conflict between different cultural and linguistic systems. William Stewart (65) has pointed out that the notion of "retardation" in the speech of some minority groups, especially among some black children, may be due to a misinterpretation of the remaining features of a former Creole-type patois still found in their speech. As the children grow up, the features of the lower-level social dialect are often gradually replaced by more standard features as the result of increased contact with different types of speech. What is in fact simply a gradual process of replacement of some linguistic features by others

can thus be misinterpreted as a process of slow and retarded linguistic development. Labov (67) has argued that the poor verbal responses of children from minority groups in many testing situations are likely to be the result of both the testing situation itself and the "elaborate defensive techniques" learned by even the very youngest children when they are put in school environments which are considered as basically foreign and opposed to their own system of values. Professor Labov concludes as follows:

> Monosyllabic answers, repressed speech, spatial intonation contours are all characteristic of such face-to-face testing situations. As a result, a great deal of public funds are being spent on programs designed to supply verbal stimulus to "non-verbal" children. The notion of cultural deprivation here is surely faulty: It is based on a mythology that has arisen about children who receive very little verbal stimulus, seldom learn complete sentences--children who are in fact supposed to be culturally empty vehicles. . . .
>
> In our research, we frequently encounter children who behave in a face-to-face encounter with adults as if they were "non-verbal." But when we utilize our knowledge of the social forces which control language behavior, and stimulate speech with more sophisticated techniques, the non-verbal child disappears. . . .
>
> These children have an extremely rich verbal culture. They are proficient at a wide range of verbal skills even though many of these skills are unacceptable within the school program.

The controversy between the theories of "cultural," or at least "verbal" deprivation, and of simple "cultural difference" is far from resolved. There seems little doubt, however, that in many instances researchers and educators have probably not sufficiently appreciated the fact that the so-called disadvantaged do belong to a special cultural and linguistic subgroup; a child simply cannot respond to or respond with words which are not part of his vocabulary. Conceptualization, whether tested verbally or with groupings of visual stimuli, depends on the availability of linguistic labels in the vocabulary: the similarity between "a baseball," "a rubber ball," and "a doll" is not at all obvious and their being grouped together under the abstract concept <u>toy</u> depends largely on the availability of the word <u>toy</u> in the vocabulary. Psycho-linguistic tests of maturity of language development almost inevitably contain a cultural bias for which it is difficult to compensate.

It is of interest to note that in some linguistic tests which are at least relatively free of cultural bias the theory of verbal retardation of the disadvantaged is not confirmed. The most recent and most provocative of these studies is the one carried out by Doris R. Entwisle concerning the verbal associations of grade school children (Entwisle & Greenberger 68, Entwisle 68). Among other features of verbal responses and association, Dr. Entwisle studied the ratios of paradigmatic vs. syntagmatic responses. (In paradigmatic response association, the response matches the form class of the stimulus. In syntagmatic associations the response is associated with the stimulus within a structure but is of a different form class and thus not linguistically substitutable: e.g., if the stimulus word is white, the response black is paradigmatic, but a response like shoelace is syntagmatic.) A marked shift from syntagmatic to paradigmatic response is associated with an advance in linguistic maturity (Entwisle 66) and there is considerable evidence that development in word association is related to various other verbal skills like the acquisition of complex syntactical structure (Brown & Berko 60).

One of the rather surprising results of the Entwisle study was that "slum children are apparently more advanced linguistically than suburban children at first grade in terms of paradigmatic responses (Entwisle 68)." There was apparently only one measure which showed the slum children, especially the Negro first graders, to be at a disadvantage: "The number of nonsense or 'Klang' responses is far greater in the Negro first graders (Entwisle & Greenberger 68)." There may be, however, a rather simple explanation of this phenomenon, namely (perhaps a mutual) linguistic misunderstanding. Even if all of the experimenters were able to understand all of the subjects' responses, it remains questionable to what extent the subjects understood the stimulus words. I have repeatedly observed that small children respond with nonsense or "Klang" responses to utterances which are or at least seem to be "nonsense" stimuli. At any rate, the Entwisle study comes to the conclusion that "over the early school years the suburban child is engaged in rapid linguistic development on several fronts. The disadvantaged child, from what appears to be a more favorite initial position

(italics ours) seems to decelerate his rate of language development (Entwisle & Greenberger 68)."

The question of the relative language aptitude and development of the disadvantaged child quite obviously calls for additional research. What seem especially needed are measures on language-learning tasks in which performance is completely unbiased by differences in the knowledge of standard English, (e.g., do disadvantaged children show less ability in acquiring foreign languages, provided standard English terms and grammatical concepts are not used in the instructional process and motivation factors are equalized?) The difference between the stimulus deprivation and the cultural and linguistic difference theories is more than just academic. True enough, the cultural experience and the language training afforded in Head Start programs are likely to be beneficial--regardless of whether the concept underlying the program is exposure to a different language and culture, or the supplying of "additional stimuli" to the deprived. However, the two different concepts have very different implications in the long run. Stimulus deprivation places the responsibility for being disadvantaged on the home and early childhood experiences and leads to an emphasis on such programs as Head Start and the manipulation of early childhood experience. The cultural difference approach emphasizes the responsibility of the schools and holds out the hope that an understanding of both cultural and linguistic differences and radically new solutions on the part of educators, can make a major contribution.

Teaching Methodology

Just what is meant by using foreign language teaching methodology in the teaching of a second dialect is, in itself, debatable. Here we would like to comment on the two features of modern foreign language teaching methodology which are perhaps the most characteristic of the so-called "new key" in foreign language teaching; namely, the audio-lingual approach and its chief pedagogical instruments, pattern practice, and dialogue memorization. An audio-lingual approach--in the broadest general meaning of the term--implies that, especially in the initial stage of construction, all new elements of language are learned through

listening and speaking activities, before the very same elements are introduced in the reading and writing process.

The audio-lingual principle can be applied to the language teaching of the disadvantaged in two ways: (a) reading and writing can be introduced in the native dialect in which the child has already reached some audio-lingual proficiency; and (b) the standard dialect can be taught audio-lingually before reading and writing are introduced. We have stated already that it is the second application which is likely to have more permanent interest and importance. In general, this approach would lead us to emphasize audio-lingual training, preferably early in the school program. Further research will be needed to determine such details as the optimal time lag between audio-lingual learning and exposure to reading and writing, or the optimal quantity of materials to be learned audio-lingually before reading and writing are introduced. As has been pointed out by several researchers (e.g., Carroll 63, Rivers 64), the question of the optimal time lag, if any, between audio-lingual and visual learning is far from settled even in the domain of foreign language teaching. The teaching of a second dialect can, at this point, not even rely on secure findings in the sister discipline of foreign language instruction.

Whether the standard tools of present modern foreign language teaching, namely pattern practice and dialogue memorization, can be used in the learning of a second dialect is even more debatable. Obviously, they have to undergo rather drastic modifications. In many of the "new key" approaches to foreign language teaching, children are given new foreign language names and asked to pretend to be members of the foreign culture while acting out situational dialogues. The application of this principle in a situation presumably dominated by the need for establishing identity of and pride in the self would be quite clearly nonsensical. If dialogue memorization and the acting out of dialogues are used at all, the learner of the standard dialect must always remain himself, and the dialogue must clearly and unambiguously take place in a situation in which the standard dialect, rather than the native dialect, is required. The experience of some programs in standard dialect teaching has shown already (e.g., Crowley 68) that the dialogues, and the situation used in the

teaching process, must be perceived as having a real and highly functional value for the learner.

The pattern practice exercise of foreign language teaching generally takes three forms: (a) repetition exercises, in which utterances are simply echoed by the pupil; (b) substitution exercises, in which the linguistic construction remains constant but different sentences are produced by the pupil by his substituting words for other grammatically equivalent words; and (c) transformation or conversion exercises, in which sentences of one construction type are converted into another by a constant linguistic manipulation, (e.g., passive sentences are made interrogative). One of the most questionable aspects of pattern practice, at least in the form in which it is most widely used in current textbooks, is its disassociation from any conceptual or tangible reality (see Politzer 64). There is considerable, and mounting, evidence that the type of pattern practice that involves playing with linguistic symbols as empty shells is of debatable value in foreign language instruction (Oller & Obrecht 68). In second dialect teaching, where the linguistic problem is accompanied by a very real and subtle problem of cultural difference, the manipulation of empty verbal symbols will have no beneficial effect whatsoever--if for no other reason than that the pupil's motivation is not likely to last through the attempts to manipulate verbal behavior in the abstract realm, dissociated from any real communication process.

The more promising programs of second dialect instruction indicate that the stories and topics which are used must be of real interest and importance to the pupil (Crowley 68). Overtly contrasting the native dialect and standard language may be necessitated by the similarity of the two dialects. As Labov & Cohen (67a) have pointed out, the speaker of a nonstandard dialect often has only comprehension competence in the standard language, while in the nonstandard dialect he is competent at both comprehension and active expression. The result is that in many cases, depending perhaps on the real or linguistic depth of the difference involved, speakers of nonstandard English will give nonstandard echo-repetition responses to standard language stimuli. Under these circumstances, it is probably necessary to give very intensive training in the perception of the differences between standard and nonstandard speech, especially if

we do not want to perpetuate a situation--frequently observed by the author--in which the standard speech of the teacher and the nonstandard speech of the pupil simply coexist in language drills as well as in actual communication.

Teacher Training

The desired qualifications for the foreign language teacher have been subject to considerable discussion. There is presently at least some general agreement on what these qualifications should be. As expressed in a statement issued by the Modern Language Association of America (PMLA 55), and followed as general guidelines in most teacher training or retraining programs (e.g., NDEA Institute), these qualifications are expressed as language proficiency (ability to understand, speak, read, and write the foreign language); knowledge of the civilization and culture of the foreign country; familiarity with applied linguistics (chiefly the appreciation of the interference which is exerted by the pupils' native language); and teaching methodology.

If we attempt to translate these qualifications for foreign language teachers into the second dialect teaching situation we must keep in mind that the "foreign language" becomes "standard English." Just as in foreign language teaching, proficiency in the language to be taught is an obvious requirement. An important similarity between the two situations is the fact that native speakers do not necessarily make good foreign language teachers. Not everyone who can speak standard English should be considered qualified to teach it, either as a foreign language or as a second dialect. The teacher of standard English should have a thorough and linguistically accurate knowledge of the structure of the language which he is teaching, and a clear perception of the differences between speech and writing. Perhaps the most important parallel between the qualifications for foreign language and second dialect teachers lies in the applied linguistics area. Here, the qualification of the foreign language teacher consists chiefly of his knowledge of the structural differences between the target language and the native language of the pupil.

This latter qualification, when transferred to the second dialect situation, is as desirable as it may be difficult to achieve. Our knowledge

of the linguistic structure of nonstandard English dialects is relatively meager. In addition, substandard dialects are many and varied. Thus, it would be unreasonable to expect that a person trained to teach standard English as a second dialect would have a thorough knowledge of all or even many of the substandard systems. Under these circumstances, a more realistic goal of teacher training may be to make the prospective teacher of standard English as a second dialect aware of the chief examples of the main types of interference which can be expected from the nonstandard dialects, and to impart to him, not so much a detailed knowledge of the substandard, but an attitude which recognizes that substandard dialects are regular systems of communication in their own right--and are not disadvantaged, incomplete, immature, or irregular manifestations of a standard dialect.

Bibliography

Andersson, Theodore, 1967, "The Bilingual in the South West," The Florida FL Reporter, 5, No. 2, 34.

Bennett, John, 1908, "Gullah: A Negro Patois," South Atlantic Quarterly, 7.

Bernstein, Basil, 1961, "Social Structure, Language and Learning," Educational Research, 3, 163-176.

Brown, Roger and Jean Berko, 1960, "Word Association and the Acquisition of Grammar," Child Development, 31, 1-14.

Bull, W. E., 1955, "The Use of Vernacular Languages in Fundamental Education," International Journal of American Linguistics, 21, 288-294.

Carroll, John B., 1963, "Research on Teaching Foreign Languages," Handbook of Research on Teaching (N. L. Gage, editor), Chicago, Rand McNally and Co.

Carroll, William S. and Irvin Feigenbaum, 1967, "Teaching a Second Dialect and Some Implications for TESOL," TESOL Quarterly, 1, 31-40.

Crowley, Dale P., 1968, "The Kesukaha Model for Mainstream Dialect Instruction," Language Learning, 18, 125-138.

Entwisle, Doris E., 1968, "Developmental Sociolinguistics: Inner City Children," American Journal of Sociology, 74, 37-49.

Entwisle, Doris E. and Ellen Greenberger, 1968, "Differences in the Language of Negro and White Grade School Children," 1, 2, Baltimore, Maryland, The Johns Hopkins University, The Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools.

Deutsch, Martin, 1965, "The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 35, 78-88.

Ferguson, Charles A., 1959, "Diglossia," Word, 15, 325-340.

Gaarder, A. Bruce, 1967, "Organization of the Bilingual School," Journal of Social Issues, 23, 110-120.

Gardner, R. C., 1960, Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition, Montreal, McGill University (Doctoral dissertation).

Keislar, Evan and Carolyn Stein, 1968, "Effects of Dialect and Instructional Procedures of Children's Oral Language Production and Concept Acquisition," Urban Education, 3, 169-176.

Labov, William, 1966, "Some Sources in Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Non-Standard English," New Directions in Elementary Education, Champaign, Illinois, National Council of Teachers of English, 140-167.

Labov, William, 1967, "The Non-Standard Vernacular of the Negro Community: Some Practical Suggestions," Temple University, Seminar in English and Language Arts (mimeographed).

Labov, William and Paul Cohen, 1967(a), "Systematic Relation of Standard and Non-Standard Rules in the Grammar of Negro Speakers," Ithaca, New York, Project Literacy Reports, No. 8, 66-84.

Labov, William and Paul Cohen, 1967(b), "Some Suggestions for Teaching Standard English to Speakers of Non-Standard Urban Dialects," New York, Bureau of Curriculum Research, Board of Education of the City of New York.

Labov, William and Clarence Robins, 1967, "A Note on the Relation of Reading Failure to Peer Group Status in Urban Ghettoes," New York, Columbia University (mimeographed).

Lambert, W. E., 1967, "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism," Journal of Social Issues, 23, 91-109.

Loflin, Marvin D., 1967, "A Teaching Problem in Non-Standard Negro English," English Journal, 1312-1314.

NEA 1968, Bilingual Education, NEA Resolutions 1968, Today's Education, 57, No. 6, 64-69.

Peal, Elizabeth and W. Lambert, 1962, The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence, Washington, D. C., Psychological Monographs, 546.

PMLA (Publication of the Modern Language Association of America), 1955, Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages, PMLA 70, 4, Part 2, 46-49.

Politzer, Robert L., 1964, "Some Reflections on Pattern Practice," Modern Language Journal, 48, 24-29.

Oller, J. W. and H. Obrecht, 1968, "Pattern Drill and Communicative Activity: A Psycholinguistic Experiment," International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 6, 167-174.

Riessman, Frank, 1966, "Digging the Man's Language," Saturday Review, 49, September 10, 81-91, 98.

Rivers, Wilga M., 1964, The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Stewart, William A., 1964, "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations," Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English, Language Information Series 2, Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

Stewart, William A., 1965, "Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic Factors Affecting English Teaching," Social Dialects and Language Learning, (R. Shuy, editor), Champaign, Illinois, National Council of Teachers of English.

Tsuzaki, Stanley M., 1966, "Hawaiian English: Pidgin, Creole, or Dialect," Pacific Speech, 1, No. 2.

Turner, Lorenzo Dow, 1949, Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Webster, Staten W. (editor), 1966, The Disadvantaged Learner; Knowing, Understanding, Educating, A collection of original and published articles, San Francisco, Chandler Publishing Co.